Exploiting Group Sparsity in 2D 1-Bit Compressive Sensing

Xiangrong Zeng
Xiangrong.Zeng@lx.it.pt
Mário A. T. Figueiredo
mario.figueiredo@lx.it.pt

Instituto de TelecomunicaÃğÃţes
Instituto Superior TÃľcnico
Lisbon, Portugal

arXiv:1402.5073v2 [cs.CV] 21 Feb 2014

Abstract

We propose a new approach, *two-dimensional binary fused compressive sensing* (2DBFCS) to recover 2D sparse piece-wise signals from 1-bit measurements, exploiting group sparsity in 2D 1-bit compressive sensing. The proposed method is a modified 2D version of the previous *binary iterative hard thresholding* (2DBIHT) algorithm, where, the objective function consists of a 2D one-sided ℓ_1 (or ℓ_2) function and an indicator function of K-sparsity and an indicator function of total variation (TV) or modified TV (MTV) constraint (the MTV favors both sparsity and piece/wise smoothness while the TV promotes the whole smoothness). The subgradient of 2D one-sided ℓ_1 (or ℓ_2) barrier and the projection onto the K-sparsity and TV or MTV constraint set are easy to compute, such that the *forward-backward splitting* can be applied in 2DBFCS efficiently. Experiments on the recovery of 2D sparse piece-wise smooth signals show that the proposed 2DBFCS with the TV or MTV is able to take advantage of the piece-wise smoothness of the original signal, achieving more accurate recovery than 2DBIHT. Especially, the 2DBFCS with the MTV and the ℓ_2 barrier performs best amongst the algorithms.

1 Introduction

We focus on recovering a sparse piece-wise smooth two-dimensional (2D) signal (an image) $\mathbf{X}$ from 1-bit measurements,

$$\mathbf{Y} = \operatorname{sign}(\mathbf{AX} + \mathbf{W}), \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{Y} \in \{-1,1\}^{M\times L}$ is the measurement matrix, sign is the element-wise sign function that returns $+1$ for positive arguments and -1 otherwise, $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N}$ is the known sensing matrix, $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times L}$ is the original 2D signal, and $\mathbf{W}$ is additive noise. Unlike in conventional *compressive sensing* (CS), 1-bit measurements loose any information about the magnitude of the original signal $\mathbf{X}$. The goal is then to recover $\mathbf{X}$, but only up to an unknown and unrecoverable magnitude [2], [4].

Our innovations, with respect to 1-bit CS as proposed in [2], are twofold: a) we address the 2D case; b) more importantly, we introduce a new regularizer favoring both sparsity and piece-wise smoothness, which can be seen as a modified 2D version of *fused lasso* [6]. This new regularizer is the indicator of a union of convex subsets (total-variation balls) of the canonical subspaces, simultaneously enforcing sparsity and smoothness within each connected subset of non-zero elements. The rationale is that, when imposing smoothness and sparseness, smoothness should not interfere with sparsity, *i.e.*, it should not be imposed across the transitions from zero to non-zero elements. The proposed regularizer promotes sparseness and smoothness and (although it is non-convex) has a computationally feasible projection, based on which we propose a modified version of the *binary iterative hard thresholding* (BIHT) algorithm [4].

2 2D Binary Iterative Hard Thresholding (2DBIHT)

To recover $\mathbf{X}$ from $\mathbf{Y}$, we first consider a 2D version of the criterion proposed by Jacques *et al* [4]

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{\mathbf{X}} f(\mathbf{Y}\odot\mathbf{AX}) + \iota_{\Sigma_K}(\mathbf{X}) \\ &\text{subject to } \|\mathbf{X}\|_2 = 1, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where: the operation "$\odot$" denotes element-wise (Hadamard) product; $\iota_C(\mathbf{X})$ denotes the indicator function of set C,

$$\iota_C(\mathbf{X}) = \begin{cases} 0, & \mathbf{X}\in C \\ +\infty, & \mathbf{X}\notin C; \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

$\Sigma_K = \left\{\mathbf{X}\in\mathbb{R}^{N\times L} : \|\mathbf{X}\|_0 \le K\right\}$ (with $\|\mathbf{V}\|_0$ denoting the number of non-zero components in $\mathbf{V}$) is the set of K-sparse $N\times L$ images; $\|\mathbf{X}\|_2 = \left(\sum_{ij} X_{(i,j)}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is the Euclidean norm, and f is one of the penalty functions defined next. To penalize linearly the violations of the sign consistency between the observations and the estimate [4], the barrier function is chosen as $f(\mathbf{Z}) = 2\left\|[\mathbf{Z}]_-\right\|_1$, where $[\mathbf{Z}]_- = \min(\mathbf{Z},0)$ (with the minimum applied entry-wise and the factor 2 included for later convenience) and $\|\mathbf{V}\|_1 = \sum_{ij}|V_{(i,j)}|$ is the ℓ_1 norm of $\mathbf{V}$. A quadratic barrier for sign violations (see [2]) is achieved by using $f(\mathbf{Z}) = \frac{1}{2}\left\|[\mathbf{Z}]_-\right\|_2^2$, where the factor $1/2$ is also included for convenience. The iterative hard thresholding (IHT) [1] algorithm applied to (2) (ignoring the norm constraint during the iterations) leads to the 2DBIHT algorithm, which is a 2D version of the *binary iterative hard thresholding* (BIHT) [4]:

Algorithm *2DBIHT*
1. set $k=0, \tau>0, \mathbf{X}_0$ and K
2. **repeat**
3. $\quad\mathbf{V}_{k+1} = \mathbf{X}_k - \tau\partial f(\mathbf{Y}\odot(\mathbf{AX}_k))$
4. $\quad\mathbf{X}_{k+1} = \mathcal{P}_{\Sigma_K}(\mathbf{V}_{k+1})$
5. $\quad k \leftarrow k+1$
6. **until** some stopping criterion is satisfied.
7. **return** $\mathbf{X}_k/\|\mathbf{X}_k\|_2$

In this algorithm, ∂f denotes the subgradient of the objective (see [4], for details), which is given by

$$\partial f(\mathbf{Y}\odot(\mathbf{AX})) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{A}^T(\operatorname{sign}(\mathbf{AX}) - \mathbf{Y}), & \ell_1 \text{ barrier}, \\ \mathbf{A}^T\left(\mathbf{Y}\odot[\mathbf{Y}\odot(\mathbf{AX})]_-\right), & \ell_2 \text{ barrier}, \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

Step 3 corresponds to a sub-gradient descent step (with step-size τ), while Step 4 performs the projection onto the non-convex set Σ_K, which corresponds to computing the best K-term approximation of $\mathbf{V}$, that is, keeping K largest components in magnitude and setting the others to zero. Finally, the returned solution is projected onto the unit sphere to satisfy the constraint $\|\mathbf{X}\|_2 = 1$ in (2). The versions of BIHT with ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 objectives are referred to as 2DBIHT-ℓ_1 and 2DBIHT-ℓ_2, respectively.

3 2D Fused Binary Compressive Sensing (2DFBCS)

The proposed formulation essentially adds a new constraint of low (modified) total variation to the criterion of 2DBIHT (2), which encourages 4-neighbor elements to be similar, justifing the term "fused".

3.1 2DFBCS with Total Variation

We first propose the following model:

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{\mathbf{X}} f(\mathbf{Y}\odot\mathbf{AX}) + \iota_{\Sigma_K}(\mathbf{X}) + \iota_{T_\varepsilon}(\mathbf{X}) \\ &\text{subject to } \|\mathbf{X}\|_2 = 1, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $T_\varepsilon = \left\{\mathbf{X}\in\mathbb{R}^{N\times L} : \mathrm{TV}(\mathbf{X}) \le \varepsilon\right\}$, with $\mathrm{TV}(\mathbf{x})$ denoting the total variation (TV), which in the two-dimensional (2D) case is defined as

$$\mathrm{TV}(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1}\sum_{j=1}^{L-1}\left(|X_{(i+1,j)} - X_{(i,j)}| + |X_{(i,j+1)} - X_{(i,j)}|\right), \tag{6}$$

and ε is a positive parameter. In the same vein as 2DBIHT, the proposed algorithm is as follows:

Algorithm *2DFBCS-TV*
1. Set $\tau>0, \varepsilon>0, K$, and $\mathbf{X}_0$
2. **repeat**
3. $\quad\mathbf{V}_{k+1} = \mathbf{X}_k - \tau\partial f(\mathbf{Y}\odot(\mathbf{AX}_k))$
4. $\quad\mathbf{X}_{k+1} = \mathcal{P}_{\Sigma_K}\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon}(\mathbf{V}_{k+1})\right)$
5. $\quad k \leftarrow k+1$

6. **until** some stopping criterion is satisfied.
7. **return** $\mathbf{X}/\|\mathbf{X}\|_2$

where line 4 is to compute the projection onto T_ε, which can be obtained by using the algorithm proposed by Fadili and Peyré [3]. The versions of the 2DBFCS-TV algorithm with ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 objectives are referred to as 2DBFCS-TV-ℓ_1 and 2DBFCS-TV-ℓ_2, respectively.

3.2 2DFBCS with Modified Total Variation

We propose the following problem formulation of 2DFBCS:

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{\mathbf{X}\in\mathbb{R}^{N\times L}} f\big(\mathbf{Y}\odot(\mathbf{AX})\big)+\iota_{\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^K}(\mathbf{X}) \\ &\text{subject to } \|\mathbf{X}\|_2=1, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where the set $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^K$ requires a more careful explanation. As usual, define $\Sigma_K=\{\mathbf{X}\in\mathbb{R}^{N\times L}:\|\mathbf{X}\|_0\le K\}$ (with $\|\mathbf{X}\|_0$ denoting the number of non-zeros in $\mathbf{X}$) as the set of K-sparse $N\times L$ images. Consider the undirected 4-nearest-neighbors graph on the sites of $N\times L$ images, *i.e.*, $\mathcal{G}=(\mathcal{N},\mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{N}=\{(i,j), i=1,...,N,\ j=1,...,L\}$ and $[(i,j),(k,l)]\in\mathcal{E}\Leftrightarrow\big((i=k)\wedge(|j-l|=1)\big)\vee\big((|i-k|=1)\wedge(j=l)\big)$. Given some $\mathbf{V}\in\mathbb{R}^{N\times L}$, let $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{V})=(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{V}),\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{V}))$ be the subgraph of $\mathcal{G}$ obtained by removing all the nodes corresponding to zero elements of $\mathbf{V}$ (that is, $(i,j)\in\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{V})\Leftrightarrow V_{(i,j)}\neq 0$), as well as the corresponding edges. Naturally, $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{V})$ may not be a connected graph; define $\{\mathcal{G}_1(\mathbf{V}),...,\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{V})}(\mathbf{V})\}$ as the set of the $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{V})$ connected subgraphs of $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{V})$, where $\mathcal{G}_k(\mathbf{V})=\big(\mathcal{N}_k(\mathbf{V}),\mathcal{E}_k(\mathbf{V})\big)$. Define the normalized TV of the sub-image of $\mathbf{V}$ corresponding to each of these connected subgraphs as

$$\overline{\mathrm{TV}}(\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{G}_k(\mathbf{V})})=|\mathcal{E}_k(\mathbf{V})|^{-1}\sum_{[(i,j),(k,l)]\in\mathcal{E}_k(\mathbf{V})}|V_{(i,j)}-V_{(k,l)}| \tag{8}$$

(assuming $|\mathcal{E}_k(\mathbf{V})|>0$) where $\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{G}_k(\mathbf{V})}$ is the subgraph indexed by $\mathcal{G}_k(\mathbf{V})$. Finally, the set $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^K\subseteq\Sigma_K$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^K=\big\{\mathbf{X}\in\Sigma_K:\overline{\mathrm{TV}}\big(\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{G}_k(\mathbf{X})}\big)\le\varepsilon, k=1,...,\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X})\big\} \tag{9}$$

In short, $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^K$ is the set of K-sparse images such that the normalized TV of each of its connected blocks of non-zeros doesn't exceed ε. Notice that this is different from the intersection of a TV ball with Σ_K, as considered in [5].

In the same vein as the 2DBIHT, We propose the following BIHT-type algorithm to solve (5):

Algorithm *2DFBCS-MTV*
1. Set $\tau>0,\varepsilon>0,K$, and $\mathbf{X}_0$
2. **repeat**
3. $\quad\mathbf{V}_{k+1}=\mathbf{X}_k-\tau\,\partial f\,(\mathbf{Y}\odot(\mathbf{AX}_k))$
4. $\quad\mathbf{X}_{k+1}=\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^K}\big(\mathbf{V}_{k+1}\big)$
5. $\quad k\leftarrow k+1$
6. **until** some stopping criterion is satisfied.
7. **return** $\mathbf{X}/\|\mathbf{X}\|_2$

In this algorithm, line 3 is also a sub-gradient descent step, where ∂f is defined as (4) while line 4 performs the projection onto $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^K$. Although $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^K$ is non-convex, here we can briefly show that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^K}$ can be computed as the follows (the details of computing $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^K}$ are shown in Appendix): first, project onto Σ_K, *i.e.*, $\mathbf{U}=\mathcal{P}_{\Sigma_K}(\mathbf{V})$; then, $\mathbf{X}=\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^K}\big(\mathbf{V}\big)$ is obtained by projecting every connected group of non-zeros in $\mathbf{U}$ onto the ε-radius normalized TV ball $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon^k$:

$$\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon^k=\big\{\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{G}_k(\mathbf{X})}\in\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}_k(\mathbf{X})}:\overline{\mathrm{TV}}\big(\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{G}_k(\mathbf{X})}\big)\le\varepsilon,\big\} \tag{10}$$

for $k=1,...,\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X})$, *i.e.*, $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{G}_k(\mathbf{U})}=\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon^k}\big(\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{G}_k(\mathbf{U})}\big)$, for $k=1,...,\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{U})$, and keeping the zeros of $\mathbf{U}$, *i.e.*, $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{G}-\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{U})}=\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{G}-\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{U})}$. Finally, as in [4], projection onto the unit sphere (line 6) satisfies the constraint in (5). The versions of the 2DBFCS-MTV algorithm with ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 objectives are referred to as 2DBFCS-MTV-ℓ_1 and 2DBFCS-MTV-ℓ_2, respectively.

Of course, the objective functions in (5) and (7) are not convex (since Σ_K is not a convex set and the $\{\mathbf{X}\in\mathbb{R}^{N\times L}:\ \|\mathbf{X}\|_2=1\}$ is also not a convex set), thus there is no guarantee that the algorithm finds a global minimum. If the original signal is known to be non-negative, then the algorithm should include a projection onto $\mathbb{R}_+^{N\times L}$ in each iteration.



Figure 1: Recovered images by different algorithms

4 Experiments

In this section, we report results of experiments aimed at comparing the performance of 2DBFCS with that of 2DBIHT. Without loss of generality, we assume the original group-sparse image $\mathbf{X}\in\mathbb{R}^{400\times 100}$, in which, 10 line-groups are randomly generated, and each line-group has 9 elements valued by 10 or -10, and Then it is followed by a normalized operation $\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{X}/\|\mathbf{X}\|_2$. The sensing matrix $\mathbf{A}$ is a 200×400 matrix whose components are sampled from the standard normal distribution. And the variance of white Gaussian noise $\mathbf{W}\in\mathbb{R}^{200\times 100}$ is 0.01. Then the observations $\mathbf{Y}$ are obtained by (1).

We run the aforementioned six algorithms, the stepsizes of 2DBIHT-ℓ_1 and 2DBIHT-ℓ_2 are set as $\tau=1$ and $1/M$, respectively, and the parameters of 2DFBCS-TV-ℓ_1, 2DFBCS-TV-ℓ_2, 2DFBCS-MTV-ℓ_1 and 2DFBCS-MTV-ℓ_2 are hand tuned for the best improvement in signal-to-noise. The recovered signals are shown in Figure 1, from which, we can clearly see that the proposed 2DBFCS basically performs better than 2DBIHT. In general, the algorithms with the ℓ_2 barrier outperforms that with the ℓ_1 barrier. Especially, the 2DFBCS-MTV-ℓ_2 shows its superiority over other algorithms, and nevertheless, the 2DFBCS-TV-ℓ_2 is also good at recovering sparse piece-wise images.

5 Conclusions

We have proposed the *2D binary fused compressive sensing* (2DBFCS) to recover 2D sparse piece-wise smooth signals from 2D 1-bit compressive measurements. We have shown that if the original signals are in fact sparse and piece-wise smooth, the proposed method, is able to take advantage of the piece-wise smoothness of the original signal, outperforms (under several accuracy measures) the 2D version of the previous method *binary iterative hard thresholding* (termed 2DBIHT), which relies only on sparsity of the original signal. Future work will involve using the technique of detecting sign flips to obtain a robust version of 2DBFCS.

References

[1] Thomas Blumensath and Mike E Davies. Iterative hard thresholding for compressed sensing. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 27(3):265–274, 2009.

[2] P.T. Boufounos and R.G. Baraniuk. 1-bit compressive sensing. In *42nd Annual Conference on Information Sciences and Systems, 2008. CISS 2008.*, pages 16–21. IEEE, 2008.

[3] J.M. Fadili and G. Peyré. Total variation projection with first order schemes. *Image Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, 20(3):657–669, 2011.

[4] L. Jacques, J.N. Laska, P.T. Boufounos, and R.G. Baraniuk. Robust 1-bit compressive sensing via binary stable embeddings of sparse vectors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1104.3160*, 2011.

[5] Anastasios Kyrillidis, Gilles Puy, and Volkan Cevher. Hard thresholding with norm constraints. In *2012 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 3645–3648. IEEE, 2012.

[6] R. Tibshirani, M. Saunders, S. Rosset, J. Zhu, and K. Knight. Sparsity and smoothness via the fused lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 67(1):91–108, 2004.